

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 9 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Support for the claim 1 amendments may be found, for example, in lines 11-24 on page 7 of the specification. No new matter is believed to have been added by these amendments. Thus, claims 1, 2, and 5-8 are pending in the present application, of which claim 1 is independent.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 paragraph 1

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being failing to comply with the written description requirement. By the foregoing amendments, claims 9 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Therefore the rejection of Claims 9 and 10 is moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 paragraph 2

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis.

By the foregoing amendments, the claim has been amended to be sufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By the foregoing amendments, the claim has been amended to more particularly out and distinctly claim its subject matter. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Response to the Examiner's remarks

On page 3 of the office action, the examiner says that applicants did not explain how the features added to the claims on July 25, 2008 overcame the art of record. In a brief telephone conference on about November 3, 2008, the examiner explained to Patrick G. Burns that he considered the remarks made on July 25, 2008, but the purpose of some amendments was unclear.

The amendments made on July 25, 2008 incorporated features of claims 3 and 4 into claim 1. Any additional amendments were made for cosmetic purposes.

The present amendments address the outstanding § 112 rejections, and more clearly define the invention over Toub and Cohen.

For example, independent claim 1 now recites features of “a step where said first computer system stores, into a memory located on said first computer system, said contents of records sent by said second computer system as database objects, updates said database objects by executing a plurality of preset data manipulations in turn, records contents of only one data manipulations as a log into said memory when said data manipulation was executed for said one database object, and **records contents of only one data manipulation** as a log that is needed to reflect to said database into said memory **when a plurality of data**

manipulations were executed for said one database object” and “a step where said first computer system stores, into one message, said **contents of said database object left in said memory** and logs recorded in said memory after final data manipulations, and after said plurality of preset data manipulations are completely executed, **sending** said message to said second computer system”.

U. S. Pat. No. 6,674,450 issued to Toub (hereinafter referred to as Toub) and U. S. Pat. No. 5,903,898 issued to Cohen (hereinafter referred to as Cohen), quoted by the Examiner on the Office Action dated March 25, 2008, do not disclose, teach, or suggest these features of claim 1 as recited above. Therefore, at least these features of claim 1 is a distinction over each of Toub and Cohen, and thus over their combination. Accordingly, the newly added features of amended claim 1 overcome the prior art.

Conclusion


In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

If a Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response is required to make the attached response timely, it is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response in the above-identified application for the period required to make the attached response timely. The Commissioner is hereby

authorized to charge fees which may be required to this application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-2069.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

November 6, 2008

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978